

OFFICE OF
Town of New Glarus

MINUTES
TOWN OF NEW GLARUS
Plan Commission Meeting
Thursday April 30, 2015

ATTENDING: Keith Seward, John Ott, John Freitag, Bob Elkins, Dean Streiff and Susan McCallum,
Deputy Clerk

ALSO ATTENDING:

ABSENT: Reginald Reis and Craig Galhouse

1. Call Meeting to Order: Chair Seward called the meeting to order at 6:37 pm.
2. Review Proof of Posting: Deputy Clerk confirmed proper posting.
3. Public Comments: None
4. Approve Minutes from March 19, 2015 minutes: R. Elkins moved to approve the March 19, 2015 minutes, 2nd by J. Freitag. Motion carried.
5. Discuss and Consider Questions Developed During Ordinance 110 Review and additional question: "Does the Revision of Seward's CSM 1254 To CSM 4876 and CSM 2233 to 4877 constitute a precedent?":

K. Seward reviewed the process of two CSMs that were pre-ordinance, reviewed and revised with two separate CSMs instead of one with two lots. He wondered whether this could be added as an additional question presented tonight, does it set a precedent. No objection to adding this question to the current list of eight questions. J. Ott asked in what form would this set a precedent, we weren't adding building potential only adjusting the size. K. Seward stated that the Plan Administrator felt this was a clearer way to track lots that were pre-ordinance. B. Elkins asked was this done because the party buying the lot wanted two CSMs. K. Seward said no. J. Ott asked McCallum how she keeps track of things, by lot or CSM. She stated CSM. He then asked what requires him to have a CSM for his property, as he does not have one. She stated that there is a lot of land out there now, which was original, that do not have CSMs, Green County requires a CSM for land divisions so they can create parcels. She then gave an example of a current land mass and how difficult it can be to track and that Green County has changed its' access to documents. This has made it much more difficult to track the splits and combinations. The topic was discussed regarding the importance of this recording scenario. There was further discussion regarding the difference in use of CSMs. J. Ott asked how does this affect the assessor. S. McCallum stated that the assessor can readily see the change in lot size. B. Elkins asked do we do it the way the surveyor wants it or the assessor. K. Seward stated that there is consensus that it is clearer to use the two CSMs process. Additional neighbor exchanges scenarios were discussed. After further discussion it was decided not to add this item to the list. J. Freitag felt this brought to light a problem at the County level regarding issues we are experiencing with the new process for property listings. McCallum recounted the change in access to documents associated with a parcel, specifically that there is now a charge associated with any inquiry. In addition it is now more difficult to tract parcel changes, some are shown as parent and child, but some do not show anything. J. Freitag felt that the county should be sharing this with Towns at no charge. K. Seward wondered whether the Town Board should complain to the County about this access change.

K. Seward posed to the commission, to organize like items on the list into same topic categories and then break down into subcommittees. There was consensus to work on the list as a whole commission. K. Seward asked how to limit the time spent on one subject. No decision was made.

OFFICE OF
Town of New Glarus

R. Elkins felt #1 and #2 could be grouped. J. Ott felt that these are defining what we want to accomplish. Discussion continued on the concept of developments with municipal services self contained within throughout the Town not just ETZ-AT. K. Seward stated that currently the ordinance does not define what those services should/could be. B. Elkins felt that we will not get any development at all because outside the ETZ-AT it is too expensive to connect to the Village. K. Seward discussed that currently there isn't an option for a developer to create a cluster system in a subdivision with shared services, so the only choice is to annex. B. Elkins felt this would drive the lot price up and create smaller lots which is not why people move to the country, to have a close neighbor. J. Ott felt we need an option to retain the tax base, but we need the financial figures to determine feasibility. K. Seward asked are we willing to pay for a study. Discussion continued regarding developing ordinance ahead of a developer request. J. Freitag wondered how much it would cost to develop a feasibility study. J. Ott wondered if Durst Road would be a likely candidate for this concept, and how to promote this area, large lot or more homes for a higher tax base. B. Elkins wondered who would pay for the district. K. Seward stated the home owners.

S. McCallum asked to break out the first sentence of #1 to focus on the change of definition of Minor to Major due to subdivisions that have already gone from smaller to larger. This has happened and now you have a major without having met the criteria for one. She said this was an important point when she, C. Galhouse and K. Seward worked on the ordinance updates. B. Elkins moved that if a developer creates more than four lots it becomes a major subdivision. Discussion continued reviewing the definitions in the current ordinance. S. McCallum pointed out the definition refers to lots but also includes an acreage criterion of 120 acres. The motion was seconded by J. Freitag. Discussion continued, with B. Elkins stating that he stated if there are more than 4 splits. Discussion continued regarding using splits or lots terminology. The current definitions use both terms. J. Freitag felt you use splits; it defines the development before lots are determined. K. Seward gave examples with 80 acres and clusters. J. Ott stated that we are defining over 4 lots, so when you get four building permits you are over a minor and into a major. Discussion continued regarding requirements of a major over a minor, what terminology to use and current definitions- there is a definition for lot but not split. B. Elkins withdrew his motion. K. Seward moved to change Article 2 Definitions, 110-5 definition of Subdivision, Major change number 9 to 5 and in the same chapter under Subdivision, Minor change the not more than 8 to 4, 2nd by J. Freitag. Motion amendment by B. Elkins to remove the term parcels from the definition of Minor, 2nd D. Streiff, Motion carried. Original motion carried.

S. McCallum will revise the language in the ordinance to reflect the change for review at next meeting.

6. Set Next Meeting Date and Agenda: K. Seward moved to adjourn at 8:15 pm, 2nd J. Freitag. Motion carried. Thursday May 21, 6:30 pm.